

Serial No. 09/864,655
Response dated March 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 28, 2004

Docket No. 4195-4002

REMARKS

Claims 236-429 are pending in this application. Claims 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410, 411 and 412 have been amended herein. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of this amendment. More specifically, independent claims 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410 and 411 have been amended to add a step or a function of “determining a priority for a received event;”. In claim 412, the server element has been amended to add a limitation of a “work flow manager for determining a priority for a received event.”

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the above amendment and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 236-429 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coley et al., U.S. Patent 5,751,914. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410, 411 and 412 as well as the claims directly and indirectly dependent therefrom are not anticipated by the cited reference in view of the following remarks.

Amended independent claim 236 recites,

A method for facilitating event communication among networks having a plurality of systems, comprising:

receiving at least one event in a client, said event transmitted by an event-generating entity coupled thereto;

determining a priority for a received event;

obtaining at least one event handling script associated with said event; and processing said event in accordance with said event handling script.

Applicants respectfully submit that Coley does not anticipate the elements of the claimed invention.

The Coley reference does not disclose, teach or suggest determining a priority for a received event. For example, the Coley reference does not disclose whether a received event has a higher or a lower priority than a received event. Instead, Coley discloses a method and system for correlating a plurality of events within a data processing system. Specifically, Coley discloses “an improved method and system for correlating a plurality of events within a data processing system to determine an action to be performed.” (See, Coley Col. 2, ln. 2-4). Further, Coley discloses “an improved method and system for correlating a plurality of events within a data processing system which evaluate the plurality of events with respect to a predetermined rule to determine an action to be performed” (See, Coley Col. 2, ln. 6-9). This is achieved by implementing:

“a rule network...which includes a number of objects arranged in a tree structure having at least one parent object and a plurality of child objects, where a parent object is logically linked to a child object by passing an input event received by the parent object to the child object. At least one of the objects within the rule network invokes an action in response to receipt of a particular input event. In response to receipt of a series of events, the series of events is evaluated through the tree structure rule network.” (See, Coley Col. 2, ln. 14-19)

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed priority determination recited in amended independent claim 236 is not anticipated by Coley's data processing system which implements a tree-structured rule network. Coley does not disclose, teach or suggest a priority determination associated with received events -- that is, whether one received event has priority over another. Rather, Coley teaches independently evaluating a received event through a tree structured rule network to determine an action to be performed for that event. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify Coley to prioritize events.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 236 is patentably distinct from the cited reference Coley. Applicants submit that independent claims 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410 and 411 are distinct from Coley for at least similar reasons. Further, Applicants submit that claims 237-261, 263-293, 295-319, 321-351, 353-377 and 379-409, which are directly or indirectly dependent on amended independent claim 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410 or 411 respectively, are patentably distinct from the cited reference for a similar reason. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

Serial No. 09/864,655
Response dated March 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 28, 2004

Docket No. 4195-4002

CONCLUSION

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 24, 2005

By: Daniel C. Sheridan

Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No. 53,585

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281
(212) 415-8700 (telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)